IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 21-04-2006

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.K. MISRA

WRIT PETITION Nos.511 to 516, 2365, 3786, 5546,
35879, 35906, 35907, 36160 of 2003,
9403 of 2004 and 1285/03, 580, 22893 and 22894 of 2005
&
W.P.M.P.No.43608, 43632 and 43633 of 2003 and 678 of 2005

A.Mary ..Petitioner in WP No.511/2003

Velumail Asari ..Petitioner in W.P.No.512/2003

N.Ponnumuthu Nadar ..Petitioner in WP. No.513/2003

C.S.Vadivelu ..Petitioner in WP No.514/03

O.Subramanian ..Petitioner in WP No.515/03

A.Arumugam ..Petitioner in WP No.516/03

1.P.C.Subramaniya Mudali

2.T.G.Govindasamy

3.V.N.Subramani

4.K.Desappa Mudali

5.M.Arumugha Reddy

6.Valliammal

7.N.K.Govindasamy Mudaliar

8.A.Murugappa Mudali

9.S.Ponnappa Mudali

10.P.Murugesan

11.V.Anjeneyan

12.V..Oorammal

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

13.P.G.Vaikuntham

14.O.S.Thanikachalam

15.K.A.Natesan

16.Manickammal

17.N.O.Munusamy ..Petitioner in WP No.2365/03

1.Sarojini Narayanaswamy
2.M.Krishnaveni
3.S.Chandrasekar ..Petitioners in WP 3786/03

1.V.Annamalai

2.T.Subramani
3.A.M.Subramani ..Petitiners in WP No.5546/2003

1.M.Muthumani
2.M.A.Subramaniyam
3.Bellari Subramanian
4.M.G.Nagammal
5.V.Valliammal
6.A.K.Annamalai
7.S.A.Kanniappan
8.S.Ponnusamy
9.A.a.Ganapathy ..Petitioners in WP No.35879/2003

M.Singarayan ..Petitioner in WP No.35906/03

V.Arumugham ..Petitioner in WP No.35907/2003

1.J.Venkatesan
2.P.Jeyaraman
3.R.s.Orappan
4.G.Valliammal
5.S.K.Varadharajan
6.P.A.Gangadharan
9.P.K.Sivaprakasam
10.A.G.Subramanian ..Petitioner in WP No.36160/03

V.Dhasiah ..Petitioner in WP 9403/04

1.M.Subramanian
2.P.M.P.Srinivasan
3.Lakshmi
4.S.Arthanri

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

5.K.Nadesan
6.N.Govindasamy
7.M.Kannan Padayachi @ Kannu Padayachi
8.V.Palaniappan
9.M.Rathinam
10.P.Angamuthu ..Petitioners in WP No.1285/2003

A.Rapheal ..Petitioner in WP No.580/2005

V.Raghavan ..Petitioner in WP No.22893/2005

J.Selvamani ..Petitioner in WP No.22894/2005

-vs-

The Government of Tamil Nadu,
represented by its Secretary,
Tamil Development and
Culture Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai -9. ..1st Respondent in all the Petitions.

The Director of Tamil Development
and Culture, Kuralagam, Chennai -108. ..2nd Respondent in all the petitions.

The District Collector,
Kanyakumari District
at Nagercoil. ... 3rd Respondent in W.P.Nos.511 to 513/03, 35906/03, 9403/04, 580/05, 22893/05 and 22894/05

The District Collector,
Tiruvellore District
at Tiruvellore ... 3rd Respondent in W.P.Nos.514 to 516/03, 2365/03, 5546/03, 35879/03, 35907/03 and 36160/03

The District Collector,
Vellore District at
vellore. ... 4th Respondent in W.P.No.2365/03

The District Collector,
Dharmapuri at
Dharmapuri District ... 3rd Respondent in W.P.No.3786/03

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

The District Collector,
Salem,
Salem District ... 4th Respondent in
W.P.No.3786/03, 36160/03 and
3rd Respondent W.P.No.1285/03

Petitions presented under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of

I. declaration declaring Section 3 of the payment of pension to Tamil Scholars and Miscellaneous Provision Act 1983 discretion given to the Govt. to pay pension/ Grant/ Scholarship to Tamil scholars under the Act 23 of 1983 the Rules issued in G.O. No.21 Tamil Development Culture dated 20.6.84 and the consequential order of the 1st respondent issued in 1. G.O.Ms.Nos. 255 Tamil Development and culture Department dated 13.11.2002 (in W.P.Nos. 511 to 513/03) and 2. G.O.Ms.No.283 Tamil Development and Culture Department dated 5.12.02 (in W.P.Nos.514 to 516/03) respectively in so far as not paying monthly pension to the respective petitioners as discriminatory violative Article 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India as null and void and directing the Respondents to pay monthly pension to the respective petitioners from 1.1.2000 in W.P.Nos.511 to 516 of 2003)

II. Declaration declaring Sec 3 of the payment of pension to Tamil Scholars and Miscellaneous Provision Act 1983 and the discretion given to govt. to pay Pension/Grant/Scholarship to Tamil Scholars under the Act 23 of 1983, the Rules issued in G.O.Ms.No.21 Tamil Development culture dated 20.6.84 and the consequential order of the 1st respondent issued in 1. G.O.Ms.Nos. 283 Tamil Development and culture Department dated 5.12.2002 so far as not paying monthly pension to the petitioners 1 to 17 herein as discriminatory violative Article 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India as null and void and direct the Respondents to pay monthly pension with all other benefits the petitioners from 1.1.2000 in W.P.No.2365/03)

III. Declaration declaring Section 3 of the Payment of Pension to Tamil Scholars and miscellaneous Act 1983 and the discretion given to the Govt.

to pay pension/grant/Scholarship to Tamil Scholars under the Act 23 of 1983, the rules issued in G.O.Ms.NO.21 Tamil Development Culture dated 20.6.84 and the consequential order of the 1st respondent issued in G.O.Ms.NO.284 Tamil Development and Culture Department dated 5.12.2002 in so far as not paying monthly pension to the petitioners 1 to 3 herein as disculminatary violative Article 14 and 21 of the constitution of India and null and void and direct the respondents to pay monthly pension to the petitioners 1 and 3 as Tamil Scholars and the 2nd petitioner as legal heir with other benefits from 1.1.2000 (in WP.3786/2003).

IV. Declaration, declaring Section 3 of the payment of pension to Tamil Scholars and Miscellaneous Provision Act 1983 and the discretion given to

WEB COPY
https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

the Government to pay pension/Grant/Scholarship to the Tamil Scholars under the Act 23 of 1983 the Rule issued in G.O.Ms.NO.21 Tamil Development Culture dated 20.6.84 and the consequential order of the 1st respondent issued in G.O.Ms.NO.283 Tamil Development and Culture Department dated 5.12.2002 in so far as not paying monthly pension to the petitioners 1 to 3 herein as disculminatary violative Article 14 and 21 of the constitution of India as null and void and direct the respondents to pay monthly pension with all other benefits to the petitioners from 1.1.2000 (in WP.5546/2003).

V. Declaration, declaring Section 3 of the payment of pension to Tamil Scholars and Miscellaneous Provision Act 1983 and the discretion given to the Government to pay pension/Grant/Scholarship to the Tamil Scholars under the Act 23 of 1983 the Rules issued in G.O.Ms.NO.21 Tamil Development Culture dated 20.6.84 and the consequential order of the 1st respondent issued in G.O.Ms.NO.163 Tamil Development and Culture Department dated 27.6.2003 in so far as not paying monthly pension to the petitioners as disculminatary violative Article 14 and 21 of the constitution of India as null and void and direct the respondents to pay monthly pension with all other benefits to the petitioners from 1.1.2000 (in WP.35879/2003).

VI. Declaration, declaring Section 3 of the payment of pension to Tamil Scholars and Miscellaneous Provision Act 1983 and the discretion given to the Government to pay pension/Grant/Scholarship to the Tamil Scholars under the Act 23 of 1983 the Rules issued in G.O.Ms.NO.21 Tamil Development Culture dated 20.6.84 and the consequential order of the 1st respondent issued (i) in G.O.Ms.NO.255 Tamil Development and Culture Department dated 13.11.2002 and (ii)G.O.Ms.No.51 Tamil Development and culture Department dated 3.4.2003 respectively in so far as not paying monthly pension to the petitioners as disculminatary violative Article 14 and 21 of the constitution of India as null and void and direct the respondents to pay monthly pension to the petitioner from 1.1.2000 (in WP.Nos.35906 & 35907/2003)

VII. Declaration, declaring Section 3 of the payment of pension to Tamil Scholars and Miscellaneous Provision Act 1983 and the discretion given to the Government to pay pension/Grant/Scholarship to the Tamil Scholars under the Act 23 of 1983 the Rules issued in G.O.Ms.NO.21 Tamil Development Culture dated 20.6.84 and the consequential order of the 1st respondent issued in G.O.Ms.NO.117 Tamil Development and Culture Department dated 28.5.2003 in so far as not paying monthly pension to the petitioners as disculminatary violative Article 14 and 21 of the constitution of India as null and void and directing the respondents to pay monthly pension with all other benefits to the petitioners from 1.1.2000 (in WP.36160/2003)

VIII. Declaration, declaring Section 3 of the payment of pension to Tamil Scholars and Miscellaneous Provision Act 1983 and the discretion given to the Government to pay pension/Grant/Scholarship to the Tamil Scholars

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

under the Act 23 of 1983 the Rules issued in G.O.Ms.NO.21 Tamil Development Culture dated 20.6.84 and the consequential order of the 1st respondent issued in G.O.(2D) No.6 Tamil Development and Culture Department dated 23.1.2004 in so far as not paying monthly pension to the petitioner as disculminatary violative Article 14 and 21 of the constitution of India as null and void and directing the respondents to pay monthly pension to the petitioner from 11.9.1991 with all other benefits such as Bus pass, Medical allowance etc. (in WP.9403/2004)

IX. Declaration, declaring Section 3 of the payment of pension to Tamil Scholars and Miscellaneous Provision Act 1983 and the discretion given to the Government to pay pension/Grant/Scholarship to the Tamil Scholars under the Act 23 of 1983 the Rules issued in G.O.Ms.NO.21 Tamil Development Culture dated 20.6.84 and the consequential order of the 1st respondent issued in G.O.Ms.NO.283 Tamil Development and Culture Department dated 5.12.2002 in so far as not paying monthly pension to the petitioners as discriminatory, violative Article 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India as null and void and directing the Respondents to pay monthly pension with all other benefits to the petitioner from 1.1.2000 (in WP.No.1285/2003)

Declaration, declaring Section 3 of the payment of pension to Tamil Scholars and Miscelleneous Act 1983, and the direction given to the Government to pay pension/Grant/Scholarship to Tamil Scholars under the Act 23 of 1983, the rules issued in GO.Ms.No.21 Tamil Development Culture dated 20.6.1984 and the consequential order of the first Respondent issued in G.O.2(d) nO.19 DATED 10.6.2004, Tamil Development and Culture and Endowment Department dated 10.6.2004 n so far as not paying monthly pension to the petitioner as discriminatory, Violative of Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India, as null and void and direct the Respondents to pay monthly pension to the petitioner from 1.1.2000(in WP.580/2005).

xi) Declaration, declaring Section 3 of the payment of 1983 and the discretion given to the Government to pay Pension/Grant/Scholarship to Tamil scholars under the Act 23 of 1983 the rules issued in G.O.Ms.21 Tamil Development Culture dated 20.6.1984 and the consequential Order of the first Respondent issued in G.O.(2pa) Nos.25 and 24 respectively, Tamil Development Culture Department dated 28.10.2004 in so far as not paying Monthly pension to the petitioner as discriminatory, Violative, Article 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India, as null and void and direct the respondents to pay monthly pension to the petitioner from 20.6.1992 and 15.5.1987 respectively with all other benefits such as Buss pass, Medical allowance etc.(in WP.Nos.22893 and 22894 of 2005)

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Ravichandrababu
in all petitions.
For Respondents : Mr.S. Gomathynayagam
in all petitions. Special Govt. Pleader

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

COMMON JUDGMENT

All these writ petitions raise common questions of fact and law and therefore disposed of by this common judgment.

2. The petitioners in different writ petitions are either participants in the movement relating to merger of Tamil areas within the State of Tamil Nadu, who had undergone imprisonment in connection with such movement, or widows of such participants. The agitations relating to merger of Kanyakumari District and Sengottai Taluk had been launched during the year 1954. Similarly, the agitation for the merger of Tiruttani and Pallipattu had been launched in the year 1953. With a view to compensate the sufferings undergone by such agitators as well as to recognise their contributions towards merger of such areas and for development of Tamil language, the State Government had enacted Tamil Nadu Payment of Pension to Tamil Scholars and Miscellaneous Provisions Act,1983 (hereinafter referred to as "the Act"). Under the Rule making power envisaged under such Act, the Government had also framed statutory rules known as Tamil Nadu Payment of Pension to Tamil Scholars and Miscellaneous Provisions Rules, 1984, hereinafter referred to as "the Rules".

Initially under Section 3(1) of the Act, a person was eligible to receive monthly pension of Rs.150/- or a grant not exceeding Rs.10,000/- or both. However, subsequently by amendment, the quantum of pension has been increased from time to time and ultimately such pension has been fixed at Rs.3,000/- per month with Rs.15/- per month as medical allowance. Similarly, the amount payable towards family pension to the legal heirs of such participants has been correspondingly increased. However, there is no change effected in the grant of lumpsum amount not exceeding Rs.10,000/-. The Government has been sanctioning payment of such amount from time to time to various participants as evident from G.O.Ms.No.72 dated 3.3.1988, when monthly pension was sanctioned at the rate of Rs.250/- per month to the applicants. Subsequently, under G.O.Ms.No.412 dated 15.12.1989, the Government had sanctioned monthly pension to another 952 persons with effect from 1.10.1989. While the matter stood thus, some of the claimants, who had participated in connection with some of the agitations were denied payment on the ground that they were not able to produce certificate from jail authorities. The dispute was taken to the High Court and ultimately in the judgment reported in 1997 Writ L.R. 639 (K. ARUMUGHAM NADAR v. GOVT. OF TAMIL NADU AND TWO OTHERS), a learned single Judge of this Court laid down various principles relating to consideration of such application. In one such writ petition, namely, W.P.No.14718 of 1993, in the counter the State Government had indicated that under the provisions of the Act and the Rules, payment of pension is not only contemplated to the Tamil Scholars but also to those who had fought for merger of Tamil areas within the State of Tamil Nadu. The relevant portion of such counter affidavit is in fact extracted in the judgment of the High Court reported in 1999-III MLJ 728 (C. NATARAJAN AND THERS v. THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU AND OTHERS). Such decision related to many of the petitioners. Under such decision, the learned single Judge had ultimately issued the following directions :-

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

"20. Under these circumstances, I pass the following Orders :

(1) The impugned orders of the first respondent in W.P.Nos.20799, 21924, 21925, 21927 and 22587 of 1993 are quashed and the matter is remitted to the first respondent Government for passing appropriate fresh orders.

(2) The first respondent-Government is directed to consider the claim of the petitioners in W.P.Nos.14718, 15899, 19645, 19646 of 1993 and 1788 of 1994 and pass appropriate orders on the basis of the materials placed by them.

(3) The first respondent is directed to take note of the observations made above while passing fresh orders.

(4) If any additional information/material is required, it is open to the first respondent to get the same from the respective petitioners.

(5) The order shall be passed within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order."

3. Even though a specific time limit was indicated, no order was passed by the Government and, at that stage, the present petitioners had filed Contempt Petitions. After receipt of notice in those contempt petitions, the Government passed orders on 13.11.2002 sanctioning Rs.10,000/- as lumpsum payment to those of the petitioners who were participants in the movement and a sum of Rs.5000/- to those of the petitioners who are widows of the participants. The contempt petitions were subsequently closed on 13.12.2002 leaving it open to the petitioners to challenge such order passed by the Government and observing that it would be open to the petitioners to receive such amount which has been granted by the Government. Thereafter the present writ petitions have been filed challenging the validity of the provisions contained in the Act and the Rules to the extent it provides for grant of Rs.10,000/- as lumpsum. It is claimed that either monthly pension should be paid or the lumpsum amount be increased.

3.1. The main contention of the petitioners is to the effect that almost all the participants who had filed applications earlier had been paid monthly pension, which was being increased from time to time, whereas the Government, in the present case, has granted merely a payment of Rs.10,000/- / Rs.5,000/- as the case may be without any rhyme or reason, even though the petitioners had prayed for payment of monthly pension. It is submitted that no guidelines have been fixed either in the Act or in the Rules as to whether a participant should be paid monthly pension or a participant should be paid lumpsum not exceeding Rs.10,000/-. It is also contended that grant of family pension to other persons who had applied and refusal to grant family pension to the present petitioners and instead granting them a lumpsum amount as one time grant is factually discriminatory and at any rate no reason has been given in such orders passed by the Government. The petitioners have prayed that the Government should be directed to grant monthly pension to the petitioners. It has been submitted that the amount already paid as one time grant can be

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

adjusted towards such pension.

4. In the counter affidavit filed on behalf of the Government the history of the movement and the G.Os issued from time to time were indicated and it was further indicated that there has been some administrative delay and subsequently the Government had sanctioned lumpsum payment of Rs.10,000/- / Rs.5,000/- as the case may be.

5. From the materials on record, it is apparent that on earlier occasions when the Government had passed orders sanctioning payment, the Government had sanctioned monthly pension which was being increased from time to time as per the different G.Os issued by the Government. In the impugned G.O.Ms.No.255 dated 13.11.2002, (W.P.No.511 of 2003) sanctioning lumpsum amount to these petitioners, no reason has been indicated. Obviously all the petitioners had applied for grant of monthly pension. No reason whatsoever has been indicated in the present impugned orders as to why the present petitioners are only granted lumpsum amount of Rs.10,000/- or Rs.5,000/- as the case may be. There is nothing on record to indicate as to how the cases of the present petitioners are in any way different from the other grantees who had been sanctioned monthly pension under different G.Os., namely, G.O.Ms.No.412 dated 15.12.1989 and G.O.Ms.No.123 dated 20.7.1993. For example, in the matter relating to grant in respect of the petitioners in W.P.Nos. 512, 35906, 511, 513 of 2003 and one G. Srinivasan, nothing has been indicated, save and except the narration relating to previous litigation and the order passed by the Court on earlier occasion. Since such orders do not indicate any reason and in the counter affidavit also except narrating different facts, nothing has been explained as to what is the basis for granting such lumpsum and not monthly pension, such orders are liable to be quashed.

6. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners has submitted that in the provisions of the Act and the Rules, no guidelines have been given as to when a person should be granted monthly pension and when such person should be granted lumpsum.

7. Under the Rules, a Form has been prescribed indicating in what format the application should be made. One such column relates to income of the applicant. Similarly one other column relates to the period of imprisonment undergone by the applicant. Similarly, in the Form, the applicant is also required to indicate whether he is seeking for monthly pension or lumpsum grant. Initially when the provisions had been made, the lumpsum grant envisaged was Rs.10,000/-, whereas monthly pension envisaged was Rs.150/-. Keeping in view the rate of interest in those years, it may be inferred that payment of Rs.150/- per month, i.e., Rs.1,800/- per year, was considered as almost equivalent to lumpsum payment of Rs.10,000/-. Obviously, at that stage, the difference was not perceptible. It is therefore evident that during those days grant of lumpsum amount or monthly pension was obviously more or less dependent upon the option given by the applicant. In course of time, however, the amount of monthly pension has steadily increased, whereas the amount

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

payable as lumpsum grant has not at all been increased. Therefore, even though initially there was no further necessity to indicate the guidelines when lumpsum amount should be granted and when monthly pension should be granted as such course was dependent upon the option given by the applicant, the difference in the amount of benefit as it stands now is markedly visible and therefore guidelines should be indicated.

8. Nowhere in the guidelines it is indicated under what circumstances grant of monthly pension should be permitted and under what circumstances one time lumpsum payment not exceeding Rs.10,000/- should be permitted. The question is whether in the absence of any such guideline, the provisions contained in the Act and the Rules delegating such power to the Executive authority can be said to be hit by the vice of excessive delegation.

9. There is a definite line of judicial thinking to the effect that even in the absence of specific guideline, the authority can take into consideration the object of the legislation, the mischief which is sought to be cured by the legislation and other surrounding circumstances. In this context it is also well accepted that when such authority is conferred on high ranking functionary so that the vice of excessive delegation can be said to be diluted to a large extent. In the present case, the High Level Committee has been conferred with such authority. While such Committee deciding the matter can always be guided on the object of the legislation, which is to recognise and reward the efforts of the persons who have suffered on account of such movement. Apart from the above, the statutory Form in which the application is required to be made contains queries regarding the income of the applicant and the period of imprisonment. From such information, required to be given in the application, it can be reasonably concluded that it is the intention of the Legislature to come to the financial aid of those persons who have sacrificed for the cause of the development of the Tamil language/State. While identifying such persons, if the Committee comes to a conclusion that the applicant is financially very well-off, there may not be any necessity of granting monthly pension to such person and instead such person can be honoured with grant of lumpsum amount.

10. As already indicated, initially the two types of benefit were almost similar and, therefore, the applicant himself would be praying for payment of monthly pension or lumpsum grant depending upon his own age and other circumstances. In view of the gross disparity in the benefit now available, obviously, the applicants would always prefer to get the benefit of monthly pension rather than the lumpsum grant. Obviously, the prayer made by such applicants is entitled to serious consideration and the Committee should ordinarily accept the method of benefit claimed by the applicants. However, even though for the aforesaid reasons and keeping in view the presumption regarding validity of an Act or Rule, the provisions need be granted, it would be better for the Government to prescribe by Rules the method and norms for identifying as to whether the

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

applicant should be given monthly pension or lumpsum payment. Moreover, even though the amount of monthly pension has been steadily increased, there has not been any corresponding increase in the amount payable as lumpsum grant. The State Government should do well to look into this aspect and appropriately increase the lumpsum payable.

11. Even though the provisions of the statute and the Rules are being upheld, albeit reluctantly, the validity of the orders passed by the Respondent No.1 in the facts and circumstances of the case are required to be considered. It is obvious from the materials on record that all the applicants had applied for grant of monthly pension. From the materials on the record it is apparent that many similar applications considered earlier time were decided in favour of those applicants by granting the monthly pension. As a matter of fact all the applicants who had been conferred the benefit hitherto apart from the present petitioners appear to have been given the benefit of monthly pension rather than any lumpsum payment, obviously because such applicants had prayed for grant of monthly pension. In the impugned orders passed by the Government, no reason has been given as to why instead of granting monthly pension lumpsum payment has been granted. In the counter affidavit also nothing has been indicated as to why the applicants were not given the benefit of monthly pension and were merely granted lumpsum. The only excuse seems to be indicated in the counter is in the following words :-

> " ... The court had directed to pass orders in accordance with law within a period of four months. Due to the financial crisis of the State, the Government had decided to sanction a sum of Rs.10,000/- to the petitioner as an one time Grant and issued G.O.Ms.No.255 Tamil Development and Culture Department dated 13.7.2002 and sanctioned a sum of Rs.10,000/- to the petitioners as one time grant."

12. In my considered opinion, the so called financial crisis cannot be considered as a sufficient justification for mechanically granting lumpsum grant instead of granting monthly pension, more particularly when other applicants had been given the benefit of monthly pension. A reading of the counter affidavit makes it clear that as if the respondents were merely going through the formality of complying with the previous direction of the High Court possibly because of the pendency of Contempt proceeding. As a matter of fact, even though there was no specific direction in the earlier decision as to whether monthly pension should be given or lumpsum grant should be given, it is obvious from the tenor of the judgment that the learned Judge at that stage intended that these applicants should be treated at par with the applicants whose applications had been allowed and who had been given the monthly pension.

13. A contention has been raised by the respondents that the petitioners have already accepted the benefit of grant of Rs.10,000/- and therefore their prayer for grant of monthly pension should not be considered. From the materials on record, it is apparent that the applicants have accepted such benefit of Rs.10,000/- without prejudice to

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

their right to claim monthly pension and, therefore, it cannot be said that such applicants have waived their right to claim monthly pension instead of lumpsum grant.

14. For the aforesaid reasons, the impugned orders cannot be sustained and are liable to be quashed. The respondents are directed to consider the applications and to take appropriate decision regarding payment of monthly pension. Since the applicants have already been found to be eligible by the respondents, the only question now required to be considered is whether such applicants should be paid monthly pension or not. This may be done keeping in view the prayer in the applications made by each individual applicant and also the financial status of such applicants. In the event, it is decided to give monthly pension to any applicant, the sum of Rs.10,000/- or Rs.5,000/- already granted can be adjusted towards such monthly pension. This exercise should be completed within a period of twelve weeks from the date of receipt of the order. Accordingly, the writ petitions are allowed to the extent indicated above. No costs.

Sd/-
Asst. Registrar.

/true copy/

Sub Asst. Registrar.

dpk

To
1. The Government of Tamil Nadu,
   rep. by its Secretary,
   Tamil Development and Culture
   Department, Fort St. George,
   Chennai 600 009.

2. The Director of Tamil Development
   and Culture, Kuralagam, Chennai 108.

3. The District Collector,
   Kanyakumari District at Nagercoil.

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

4. The District Collector,
Tiruvellore District,
at Tiruvellore.

5. The District Collector,
Vellore District.

6. The District Collector,
Dharmapuri at Dharmapuri District.

7. The District Collector,
Salem, Salem District.

+ 17 CCs to Mr.K.Ravichandra Babu, Advocate SR NO 20604 to 20613 and 20615 to 20621

+ 1 CC to the Government Pleader SR NO 20651

bk(co)
gp/12.5.
Compared by E.V, CH

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/